

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

ROBERT ROBLES,

Defendant and Appellant.

B223304

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. TA104655)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. Gary E. Daigh, Judge. Affirmed.

Robert Robles, in pro. per., and Christopher Love, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

On the afternoon of December 31, 2008, defendant Robert Robles parked his car perpendicular to Francisco Mota's car. Defendant's cousin walked up to Mota's car, pointed a semiautomatic handgun at Mota's head, and demanded money. After Mota handed over all of his cash, defendant, who had exited his car, struck Mota's head with a closed fist. Defendant then drove away with his cousin as a passenger. A jury convicted defendant of second degree robbery and found that a principal used a firearm in the commission of the offense.

Defendant filed a timely appeal. We appointed counsel to represent defendant on appeal. After examination of the record, counsel filed an opening brief raising no issues and asking this court to independently review the record. On September 21, 2010, we advised defendant he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues he wished us to consider. On October 1, 2010, defendant filed a letter raising an issue of ineffective assistance of counsel.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that defendant's attorney has fully complied with his responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 109–110; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

Defendant argues that he asked his attorney "to point out certain details" from the statement defendant made to police after his arrest, but his attorney failed to introduce that "important piece of evidence." Our review of the record reveals that defense counsel sought to introduce statements made by defendant to a detective, but the trial court sustained the prosecutor's motion to exclude such statements as inadmissible hearsay. This ruling by the trial court was correct. Defendant's self-serving out-of-court statements to police were inadmissible hearsay.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

MALLANO, P. J.

We concur:

ROTHSCHILD, J.

JOHNSON, J.